arXiv:quant-ph/0201113v1 25 Jan 2002

Lorentz-Invariant Time-Energy Uncertainty Relation for Relativistic Photon

S.N.Molotkov

Institute of Solid-State Physics, Russian Academy of Sciences
Chernogolovka, Moscow district, 142432 Russia

Abstract

The time-energy uncertainty relation is discussed for a relativistic massless particle. The Lorentz-invariant uncertainty relation is obtained between the root-mean-square energy deviation and the scatter of registration time. The interconnection between this uncertainty relation and its classical analogue is established.

The notion of time-energy uncertainty relation

$$\overline{(\Delta\varepsilon)^2}\cdot\overline{(\Delta t)^2}\geq\frac{1}{4} \tag{1}$$

in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics is not so well defined as the other relations of this type, e.g., the coordinate-momentum uncertainty relation [1–4]. This is primarily caused by the fact that time is not a dynamical variable corresponding to a certain Hermitian operator, but is a parameter. Because of the presence of a lower bound in the spectrum of Hamiltonian, one generally cannot introduce the Hermitian time operator [5]. The time-energy uncertainty relation was discussed in many works for a great variety of situations. For instance, in [6] the time-energy relation was derived for the internal evolution of a quantum system, but it did not describe the measurement process. A Hamiltonian allowing the instantaneous (in a time as short as one likes), exact, and reproducible energy measurement for a quantum system was written in [7]. True enough, no example of a physical system is known so far to which this Hamiltonian could be applied. In [7], the fact was used that external classical fields of a duration as short as one likes and an intensity as high as one likes are allowed by the formal apparatus of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. This approach has come to criticism in [8]. For the relativistic case, the restrictions placed by special relativity on the measurability of quantum states were first discussed in [9]. Further inquiry was undertaken in [10]. It turned out that, strictly speaking, only the classical fields (potentials) can be treated classically in the Hamiltonian. The time-dependent fields require quantum approach. Hence, the question of exact and reproducible energy measurement in a time as short as one likes was, in fact, merely reformulated in different terms.

Although time is not a dynamical variable, the measurement of event time is a rather routine experimental situation [11]. Let the event time be fixed experimentally; in this case, the registration time is a space of results. The interrelation between the probability distribution on the space of results (registration time) and the state of quantum system is specified by a positive operator-valued measure. More precisely, to every subset $\Delta_t\in(-\infty,\infty)$ of the space of results there is a positive operator $\mathcal{M}(\Delta_t)$ such that

$$\mathcal{M}(\cup\Delta_{it})=\sum_i\mathcal{M}(\Delta_{it}),\quad \Delta_{it}\cap\Delta_{jt}=\emptyset, \tag{2}$$

The normalization condition is that the total probability of events occurring over all space of results is unity:

$$\mathcal{M}(\Delta_{(-\infty,\infty)})=I,\quad \Delta_{(-\infty,\infty)}\equiv(-\infty,\infty). \tag{3}$$

In addition, the operator-valued measure in the identity resolution (2) must satisfy the covariance condition. In the preparation of quantum state, the shifts in time origin must lead to corresponding shifts in the probability distribution; one has

$$\hat{U}_{t_0}\mathcal{M}(\Delta_t)\hat{U}_{t_0}^{-1} = \mathcal{M}(\Delta_{t-t_0}), \tag{4}$$

where $\hat{U}_t$ is the evolution (time shift) operator. One can introduce the most symmetric time operator

$$\hat{t} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} t\mathcal{M}(t, dt). \tag{5}$$

The mean registration time is given by the standard expression

$$\overline{t} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} t\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{M}(t, dt)\rho\}, \tag{6}$$

where ρ is the density matrix of a quantum system subjected to measurement.

Accordingly, the root-mean-square deviation of registration time is defined as

$$\overline{(\Delta t)^2} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t - \overline{t})^2\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{M}(t, dt)\rho\}. \tag{7}$$

If $\hat{H}$ is the Hamiltonian of the system, then its spectral representation is

$$\hat{H} = \int_0^{\infty} \varepsilon\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon, d\varepsilon), \tag{8}$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon, d\varepsilon)$ is the spectral family of orthogonal projectors. Note that the operator-valued measures $\mathcal{M}(t, dt)$ in Eq. (2) are not orthogonal. The mean energy and the root-mean-square deviation are defined for the system in quantum state ρ as

$$\overline{\varepsilon} = \int_0^{\infty} \varepsilon\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon, d\varepsilon)\rho\}, \tag{9}$$

$$\overline{(\Delta\varepsilon)^2} = \int_0^{\infty} (\varepsilon - \overline{\varepsilon})^2\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon, d\varepsilon)\rho\}. \tag{10}$$

Next, one may raise the question as to the attainable lower bound of the time-energy uncertainty relation, i.e., the question of what are the quantum states for which the functional

$$\Omega = \min_{\{\rho\}} \left\{\overline{(\Delta\varepsilon)^2} \cdot \overline{(\Delta t)^2}\right\} \tag{11}$$

reaches its minimum. Below, the time-energy relation in the sense given by Eqs. (2–11) is considered for a one-dimensional massless relativistic particle (photon). Although being model, this example, nevertheless, encompasses all main features of the problem. Moreover, experiments with photons, as a rule, are carried out in one-dimensional optical fiber systems.

Inasmuch as time is not an absolute category in the relativistic case, the notion of time-energy uncertainty relation, at first glance, is defined even worse than in the nonrelativistic case. However, the distinctive feature of a photon is that its momentum and energy are linearly related to each other. Moreover, since the mass shell of a massless field coincides with the leading part of the light cone in momentum representation, all events for the states propagating in one direction occur at the light cone in the Minkowski space-time. As a result, the time-energy uncertainty relation becomes Lorentz-invariant (independent of the inertial coordinate system where the measurement is carried out). The lower bound in inequality (1) becomes slightly higher than 1/4.

Despite the fact that time is not an absolute category in the relativistic case and that, in contrast to the nonrelativistic case, the notion of the state (wave function) at a given instant of time (i.e., strictly speaking, the Schrödinger representation) does not exist, the time-energy uncertainty relation in the sense of Eqs. (2–11) is well defined.

The states of a free quantized field (more precisely, the generalized eigenvectors) are generated by the action of field operators (generalized functions with operator values)

$$\varphi^{+}(\hat{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int d\hat{k}\delta(\hat{k}^2)\theta(k_0)\mathrm{e}^{i\hat{k}\hat{x}} a^{+}(\hat{k}), \tag{12}$$

$$\hat{k} = (k, k_0), \quad \hat{x} = (x, t), \quad \hat{k} = dk dk_0, \quad \hat{k}\hat{x} = kx - k_0 t.$$

on the vacuum vector [12]. The creation and annihilation operators satisfy relations

$$[a^{-}(\hat{k}), a^{+}(\hat{k}')] = k_0 \delta(k - k'). \tag{13}$$

The field physical states $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ belonging to the Hilbert space of states are obtained by integrating the generalized operator functions together with basic functions $\psi(\hat{x}) \in \Omega(\hat{x})$; the generalized eigenvectors $(\varphi^{+}(\hat{x})|0\rangle \in \Omega^{*}(\hat{x})$ are continuous linear functionals on $\Omega(\hat{x})$, where $\Omega(\hat{x}) \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \Omega^{*}(\hat{x})$ is the rigged Hilbert space [13] – Gel'fand triple). One has

$$|\psi\rangle = \int d\hat{x}\psi(\hat{x})\varphi^{+}(\hat{x})|0\rangle = \int d\hat{k}\psi(\hat{k})\delta(\hat{k}^2)\theta(k_0)a^{+}(\hat{k})|0\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{k_0} \psi(k, k_0 = |k|)|\hat{k}\rangle, \tag{14}$$

$$|\hat{k}\rangle = a^{+}(\hat{k})|0\rangle, \quad \langle\hat{k}|\hat{k}'\rangle = k_0\delta(k - k'), \quad \psi(\hat{k}) = \int d\hat{x}\psi(\hat{x})\mathrm{e}^{-i\hat{k}\hat{x}},$$

where dk/k_0 the Lorentz-invariant integration volume.

The contribution to the physical state $|\psi\rangle$ comes from the amplitude $\psi(k, k_0 = |k|)$ at the mass shell (leading part of the light cone in momentum representation).

We consider the states propagating in one direction. For the states propagating in both directions, the notion of event time has no sense. For the states propagating in one direction (for definiteness, $k > 0$), energy and momentum are one and the same, because of the linear relationship between them, $k_0 = |k| = k$. For these states, only the vectors with $k > 0$ make contribution to Eq. (14), and the amplitude $\psi(k, k)$ is nonzero at $k > 0$.

The energy (momentum) measurement is given by the identity resolution in the subspace of one-particle states:

$$I = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{k_0} |\hat{k}\rangle\langle\hat{k}| = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}(k, dk), \quad \mathcal{M}(k, dk) = |\hat{k}\rangle\langle\hat{k}|\frac{dk}{k_0}, \quad I_{+} = \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}(k, dk). \tag{15}$$

In actuality, it will suffice to restrict oneself to the subspace of states projected onto the vectors $|\hat{k}\rangle$ with $k > 0$, I_{+} is unity in this subspace. The probability of measuring energy (momentum) in the interval $(k, k + dk)$ is given by

$$\mathbf{Pr}\{dk\} = \mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{M}(k, dk)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\} = |\psi(k, k)|^2 \frac{dk}{k} = |f(k)|^2 dk, \quad f(k) = \frac{\psi(k, k)}{\sqrt{k}}. \tag{16}$$

The mean energy (momentum) in the state $|\psi\rangle$ is

$$\overline{k} = \int_{0}^{\infty} k\mathbf{Pr}\{dk\} = \int_{0}^{\infty} k|f(k)|^2 dk, \tag{17}$$

and the root-mean-square deviation is

$$\overline{(\Delta k)^2} = \int_0^\infty (k - \overline{k})^2 \mathbf{Pr}\{dk\} = \overline{k^2} - (\overline{k})^2, \quad \overline{k^2} = \int_0^\infty k^2 \mathbf{Pr}\{dk\}. \tag{18}$$

Let us now consider the measurement of particle position; for the states propagating in one direction ($k > 0$), this position can be represented by the expansion of unity:

$$I_+ = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{dx}{2\pi} \left(\int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{\sqrt{k}} \mathrm{e}^{-i\hat{k}\hat{x}} |\hat{k}\rangle \right) \left(\int_0^\infty \frac{dk'}{\sqrt{k'}} \langle \hat{k'} | \mathrm{e}^{i\hat{k'}\hat{x}} \right) = \tag{19}$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{d\tau}{2\pi} \left(\int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{\sqrt{k}} \mathrm{e}^{-ik\tau} |\hat{k}\rangle \right) \left(\int_0^\infty \frac{dk'}{\sqrt{k'}} \langle \hat{k'} | \mathrm{e}^{ik'\tau} \right) = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \mathcal{M}(\tau, d\tau),$$

where $\tau = x - t$. The measurement of the coordinate x is, in fact, the measurement of response time t. More precisely, the space of results is formed not by x and t separately, but by their difference τ. The expansion of unity in Eq. (19) formally describes a device; it can be interpreted as follows. If the space of results is formed by x, then the measurement should be understood as an x-distributed device generating random result at point $(x, x + dx)$ and time t. If x is fixed, then the measurement describes an x-localized instrument operating in a trigger mode and generating result at a random instant of time. The fact that the operator-valued measure $\mathcal{M}(\tau, d\tau)$ in Eq. (19) depends only on the difference $\tau = x - t$ means that, if the result can be obtained at the point x at the time instant t with a certain probability, then the same result can be obtained at a different point x' with the same probability, but at the instant of time $t' = x' - x + t$.

Accordingly, the probability to obtain the result at time interval $(\tau, \tau + \tau)$ is, by definition,

$$\mathbf{Pr}\{d\tau\} = \mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{M}(\tau, d\tau) |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\} = |f(\tau)|^2 d\tau, \tag{20}$$

$$f(\tau) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{\sqrt{k}} \psi(k, k) \mathrm{e}^{-ik\tau}. \tag{21}$$

It is notable that $f(\tau)$ coincides with the Landau-Peierls wave function in coordinate representation [14]. Contrary to $\overline{k}$, the mean value of $\overline{\tau}$ can be chosen to be zero upon the appropriate choice of time origin. The root-mean-square deviation of registration time is

$$\overline{(\Delta\tau)^2} = \int_{-\infty}^\infty d\tau \mathbf{Pr}\{d\tau\} = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \tau^2 |f(\tau)|^2 d\tau = \tag{22}$$

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dk dk' f(k) f^*(k') \int_{-\infty}^\infty \tau^2 \mathrm{e}^{i(k-k')\tau} d\tau = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty dk dk' f(k) f^*(k') \frac{\partial^2}{\partial k \partial k'} \delta(k - k') =$$

$$\int_0^\infty \left| \frac{df(k)}{dk} \right|^2 dk.$$

The further goal consists of finding the state $|\psi\rangle$, for which the functional

$$\Omega(f) = \left(\int_0^\infty \left| \frac{df(k)}{dk} \right|^2 dk \right) \left(\int_0^\infty (k^2 - \overline{k}^2) |f(k)|^2 dk \right), \tag{23}$$

is minimum under the additional normalization condition

$$\langle\psi|\psi\rangle = \int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{k} |\psi(k, k)|^2 = \int_0^\infty |f(k)|^2 dk = 1. \tag{24}$$

It turns out that the problem

$$\frac{\delta\Omega(f)}{\delta f} = 0 \tag{25}$$

of minimizing functional (23) was solved for classical signals in the elegant though little-known work [15] as early as 1934 (see also [16,17]). It was shown that, for the time-frequency uncertainty relation defined as in Eq. (23), the functional reaches its minimum on even time functions $f(\tau)$ (accordingly, $df(k)/dk|_{k=0} = 0$). The corresponding variational problem reduces to the second-order differential equation for $f(k)$ of the form

$$\frac{d^2 f(x)}{dx^2} + \left(\nu + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{x^2}{4}\right) f(x) = 0, \quad x = \left(\frac{4a}{b-c^2}\right)^{1/4}(k-c), \quad \nu + \frac{1}{2} = \sqrt{a(b-c^2)}, \tag{26}$$

where

$$a = \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{df(k)}{dk}^2\right)^2 dk, \quad b = \int_0^\infty k^2 f(k)^2 dk, \quad c = \int_0^\infty k f(k)^2 dk, \quad \int_0^\infty f^2(k) dk = 1, \tag{27}$$

Here, the integrals a, b, c are taken along the extremum. Taking into account that $df(k)/dk|_{k=0} = 0$ and that $b = 3c^2/2$ for the extremum, the solution is given by the parabolic cylinder function (Weber function) $D_\nu(x)$ [18]. The value of ν is determined from the condition $D'_\nu(x) = dD_\nu(x)dx = 0$. Taking into account that

$$D_\nu(x) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-x^2/4}}{\Gamma(-\nu)} \int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{-x\xi - \xi^2/2} \xi^{-\nu-1} d\xi, \tag{28}$$

this is equivalent to the solution of the transcendental equation

$$D'_{\mu-\frac{1}{2}}(-2\sqrt{\mu}) = 0, \quad \int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{2\sqrt{\mu}\xi - \xi^2/2} \xi^{-\mu-1/2}(\xi - \sqrt{\mu}) d\xi = 0. \tag{29}$$

where $\mu = \nu + 1/2$. The numerical value is given in [17] : $\mu^2 = 0.2951...$ The functional in its extremum equals

$$\Omega_{min}(f) = \frac{a \cdot b}{3} = \mu^2 = 0.2951.. \tag{30}$$

Let us now show that these time-energy uncertainty relations are Lorentz-invariant, i.e., remain unchanged upon measuring quantum state in any inertial frame of reference. The measurements in the observer's frame of reference themselves are formulated as in Eqs. (15) and (19); in doing so, by all quantities in Eqs. (15) and (19) should be meant their values in the observer's frame of reference, while the state obtained by the action of the respective unitary operator of the Poincare group representation should be taken as a quantum state "seen" by the observer in the moving coordinate system. The general coordinate transformation in the Poincare group consists of the translation in the Minkowski space-time and the Lorentzian rotation; one has

$$\hat{x}' = \hat{P}(\hat{a})\hat{L}\hat{x} = \hat{L}\hat{x} + \hat{a}, \tag{31}$$

where $\hat{P}(\hat{a})$ is the operator of translation by $\hat{a} = (a, a_0)$ and $\hat{L}$ is the operator of Lorentzian rotation describing the transition to a different inertial system. These transformations induce operator transformations

$$\mathbf{\hat{U}}(\hat{L}, \hat{a}) a^+(\hat{k}) \mathbf{\hat{U}}^{-1}(\hat{L}, \hat{a}) = \mathrm{e}^{i\hat{L}\hat{k}\cdot\hat{a}} a^+(\hat{L}\hat{k}), \tag{32}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{U}}(\hat{L},\hat{a})$ is the unitary operator acting in $\mathcal{H}$.

The transformed state effectively seen by the observer is

$$|\psi(\hat{L},\hat{a})\rangle = \hat{\mathbf{U}}(\hat{L},\hat{a})|\psi\rangle = \tag{33}$$

$$\int d\hat{x}\psi(\hat{x})\hat{\mathbf{U}}(\hat{L},\hat{a})\varphi^{+}(\hat{x})\hat{\mathbf{U}}(\hat{L},\hat{a})^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{U}}(\hat{L},\hat{a})|0\rangle =$$

$$\int d\hat{x}\psi(\hat{x})\varphi(\hat{L}\hat{x}+\hat{a})|0\rangle = \int d\hat{x}\psi(\hat{L}^{-1}(\hat{x}-\hat{a}))\varphi^{+}(\hat{x})|0\rangle =$$

$$\int d\hat{k}\psi(\hat{k})\mathrm{e}^{i\hat{k}\hat{k}\cdot\hat{a}}\delta(\hat{k}^2)\theta(k_0)a^{+}(\hat{L}\hat{k})|0\rangle = \int d\hat{k}\psi(\hat{L}^{-1}\hat{k})\mathrm{e}^{i\hat{k}\hat{a}}|\hat{k}\rangle =$$

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{k}\psi(\hat{L}^{-1}\hat{k})\mathrm{e}^{i\hat{k}\hat{a}}|\hat{k}\rangle = \int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{k}\psi\left(\frac{k-\beta k_0}{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}},\frac{k_0-\beta k}{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}\right)\mathrm{e}^{i(ka-k_0a_0)}|\hat{k}\rangle,$$

where dk/k_0 is the Lorentz-invariant volume of integration. In Eq. (33), the invariance of the vacuum vector, $\hat{\mathbf{U}}(\hat{L},\hat{a})|0\rangle = |0\rangle$, is also taken into account. Recall that only those states are considered which propagate in one direction along the x axis. The final state seen by the observer is written as

$$|\psi(\hat{L},\hat{a})\rangle = \int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{k}\psi\left(k\sqrt{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}},k\sqrt{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}}\right)|\hat{k}\rangle. \tag{34}$$

The mean energy (momentum) measured by the observer is defined as (the quantities in the moving coordinate system are labeled m)

$$\overline{k_m} = \int_0^\infty k\mathbf{Pr}\{dk\} = \int_0^\infty k\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{M}(k,dk)|\psi(\hat{L},\hat{a})\rangle\langle\psi(\hat{L},\hat{a}|\} = \tag{35}$$

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{k}k\Big|\psi\left(k\sqrt{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}},k\sqrt{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}}\right)\Big|^2 = \overline{k}\sqrt{\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}}.$$

At small $\beta \ll 1$, the mean momentum (energy) in the moving system is related to its value in the fixed coordinate system by the expression

$$\overline{k_m} = \overline{k}(1+\beta) = k(1+\frac{v}{c}), \tag{36}$$

which, in fact, is a formulation of the Doppler effect. The respective energy (momentum) root-mean square deviation in the moving coordinate system is

$$\overline{(\Delta k)^2_m} = \int_0^\infty (k-\overline{k_m})^2\mathbf{Pr}\{dk\} = \int_0^\infty (k-\overline{k_m})^2\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{M}(k,dk)|\psi(\hat{L},\hat{a})\rangle\langle\psi(\hat{L},\hat{a}|\} = \tag{37}$$

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{k}(k-\overline{k_m})^2\Big|\psi\left(k\sqrt{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}},k\sqrt{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}}\right)\Big|^2 = \left(\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}\right)\overline{(\Delta k)^2}.$$

The root-mean square deviation of registration time in the moving system is defined as (for the sake of convenience, the coordinate systems in this formula have the common origin, i.e., $\hat{a}=0$, and only the Lorentzian rotation $\hat{L}$ is retained)

$$\overline{(\Delta\tau)^2_m} = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \tau^2\mathbf{Pr}\{d\tau\} = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \tau^2\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{M}(\tau,d\tau)|\psi(\hat{L},\hat{0})\rangle\langle\psi(\hat{L},\hat{0}|\} = \tag{38}$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \tau^2\Big|\int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{\sqrt{k}}\mathrm{e}^{-ik\tau}\psi\left(k\sqrt{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}},\sqrt{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}}\right)\Big|^2\frac{d\tau}{2\pi} =$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tau^2 \Big| \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dk}{\sqrt{k}} \mathrm{e}^{-ik\left(\tau\sqrt{\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}}\right)} \psi(k,k) \Big|^2 d\left(\frac{\tau}{2\pi}\sqrt{\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}}\right) = \overline{(\Delta\tau)^2}\left(\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}\right).$$

It follows from Eqs. (37) and (38) that the resulting time-energy uncertainty relation in the observer's moving coordinate system is related to the uncertainty relation in the initial system as

$$\overline{(\Delta k)^2_m} \cdot \overline{(\Delta\tau)^2_m} = \overline{(\Delta k)^2} \cdot \overline{(\Delta\tau)^2} = 0.2951.. > \frac{1}{4}. \qquad (39)$$

i.e., it is Lorentz-invariant.

The fact that the time-energy uncertainty relation is Lorentz-invariant is due, in fact, to the covariance of the energy (momentum) and event-time measurements. Indeed, the operator-valued measure in Eq. (19) is covariant about the Poincare group transformations:

$$\hat{\mathbf{U}}(\hat{L},\hat{a})\mathcal{M}(\tau,d\tau)\hat{\mathbf{U}}(\hat{L},\hat{a})^{-1} = \mathcal{M}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}}\tau - (a-a_0), d\left(\sqrt{\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}}\tau\right)\right). \qquad (40)$$

The momentum measurement and the orthogonal operator measure in Eq. (15) also satisfy the covariance condition

$$\hat{\mathbf{U}}(\hat{L},\hat{a})\mathcal{M}(k,dk)\hat{\mathbf{U}}(\hat{L},\hat{a})^{-1} = \mathcal{M}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}}k, d\left(\sqrt{\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}}k\right)\right). \qquad (41)$$

If the measurement occurs in the same inertial coordinate system, $\hat{L} = \hat{1}$, then the covariance condition (41) is analogous to the nonrelativistic case (4) with the only difference that the covariance is understood in the sense of translations in the Minkowski space-time (in our case, shifts along the light cone branch).

I am grateful to S.S.Nazin for discussions and critical remarks.

This work was supported by the projects "Physical Foundations of Quantum Computer" and "Electronic States".

References

[1] W.Heisenberg, Z. Phys., **60**, 56 (1927).

[2] N.Bohr, Selected Scientific Works (Nauka, Moscow, 1971), Vol. 2.

[3] N.S.Krylov and V.A.Fok, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **17**, 93 (1947).

[4] E.P.Wigner, *On the time-energy uncertainty relation*, in *Aspects of Quantum Theory*, ed.A.Salam, E.P.Wigner, Cambridge University Press, Mass., 237 (1972).

[5] A.S.Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980.

[6] L.I.Mandel'shtam and I.E.Tamm, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Fiz. **9**, 122 (1945).

[7] Y.Aharonov, D.Bohm, Phys. Rev., **122**, 1649 (1961); Y.Aharonov, J.L.Safko, Ann. Phys., **91**, 279 (1975).

[8] V.A.Fok, Zh. Eksp. Teor Fiz. **42**, 1135 (1962) [Sov. Phys. JETP **15**, 784 (1962)].

[9] L.D.Landau and R.Peierls, Z. Phys. **69**, 56 (1931); L.D.Landau, *A Collection of Scientific Works* (Nauka, Moscow, 1969), Vol.1, p.56.

[10] N.Bohr and L.Rosenfeld, Math.-Fys. Medd. **12**, 3 (1933); N.Bohr, *A Collection of Scientific Works* (Nauka, Moscow, 1971).

[11] P.Busch, *The Time Energy Uncertainty Relation*, quant-ph/0105049; P.Busch, M.Grabowski, P.J.Lahti, *Operational Quantum Physics*, Springer Lecture Notes in Physics, v.**31**, 1995.

[12] N.N.Bogolyubov, A.A.Logunov, A.I.Oksak, and I.T.Todorov, *General Principles of Quantum Field Theory* (Nauka, Moscow, 1987).

[13] I.M.Gel'fand and N.Ya.Vilenkin, *Generalized Functions* (Fizmatgiz, Moscow, 1961; Academic, New York, 1964), Vol.4.

[14] L.D.Landau and R.Peierls, Z. Phys. **62**, 188 (1930); L.D.Landau, *A Collection of Scientific Works* (Nauka, Moscow, 1969), Vol.1, p.32.

[15] A.G.Mayer and E.A.Leontovich, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **4**, 353 (1934).

[16] A.A.Kharkevich, *Spectra and Analysis* (Fizmatgiz, Moscow, 1962).

[17] V.V.Dodonov and V.I.Man'ko, in *Invariants and Evolution of Nonstationary Quantum Systems*, Ed. by M.A.Markov (Nauka, Moscow, 1987), Tr. Fiz. Inst. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vol.183.

[18] *Heigher Transcendental Functions (Bateman Manuscript Project)*, Ed. by A.Erdelyi (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953; Nauka, Moscow, 1966).